REMARKS

Claims 1-8 have been cancelled. Thus, Claims 9-24 are currently pending in the present application, none of which has been amended.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-8 have been cancelled; thus, the § 101 rejection is deemed moot.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-12, 14-15, 17-20 and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Praitis et al.* (US 6,594,697) in view of *Schneider* (US 6,338,082). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection.

Claim 9 (and similarly Claim 17) recites "means for defining a subset of characters as delimiters," "means for constructing a search key," "means for performing a full match search within a lookup table utilizing said search key," "means for returning to said constructing a search key, in response to finding a matching pattern within said lookup table," and "means for utilizing the previous full match search result to process said data string, in response to not finding a matching pattern within said lookup table." Furthermore, the claimed means for constructing a search key is performed by two separate steps, namely, "generating a full match search increment" and "concatenating a pattern search prefix to said full match search increment to form said search key."

On page 4 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner states that the claimed concatenating step was not disclosed by *Praitis,* but the Examiner asserts that the claimed concatenating step was disclosed by *Schneider* in col. 11, lines 34-52. The Examiner further asserts that the claimed means for performing, the claimed means for returning and the claimed means for utilizing are also disclosed by *Schneider* in col. 15, lines 43-62, col. 15, lines 43-62 and col. 14, line 66 - col. 15, line 17, respectively. Basically, the Examiner has cited *Praitis* for disclosing the claimed

means for defining a subset of characters as delimiters and a first part of the claimed means for constructing a search key, and has cited *Schneider* for disclosing a second part of the claimed means for constructing a search key and the remaining claimed means. It is apparent that one of the reasons the Examiner arrived at the above-mentioned assertions is that the Examiner had reconstructed the claimed invention from the prior art by using Applicants' claim as a "blueprint." The Examiner cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among disclosures in the prior art to make the § 103 rejection. Thus, *Praitis* cannot be combined with *Schneider* for the § 103 rejection unless some nexus between *Praitis* and *Schneider* can be provided by the Examiner, especially when *Praitis* is related to the ability of a client to manipulate a response received by the client from a server and *Schneider* is related to a method for integrating resource location and registration services.

In addition, neither *Praitis* nor *Schneider* teaches or suggests the claimed means, as asserted by the Examiner. For example, on page 4 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed "means for defining a subset of characters as delimiters such that all remaining characters are defined as non-delimiters" is disclosed by *Praitis* in col. 13, lines 32-47 and col. 14, lines 13-27. But it is clear that the above-cited passages do not teach or suggest the claimed means for defining because the claimed term "non-delimiters" (or its equivalent) is not even mentioned in the above-cited passages. As another example, on page 4 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed "means for performing a full match search within a lookup table utilizing said search key" is disclosed by *Schneider* in col. 15, lines 43-62. It is also clear that the above-cited passage does not teach or suggest the claimed means for performing because the claimed term "lookup table" (or its equivalent) and the claimed term "said search key" (or its equivalent) are not found in the above-cited passage.

Because the claimed invention recites novel features that are not found in the cited references, whether considered separately or in combination, the § 103 rejection is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Claims 9-24 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 9 and 17 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of this application, please charge it against IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 50-0563.

Respectfully submitted,

Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
8911 N. Cap. of Texas Hwy, suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS